May 6, 2003

SENT BY FAX

NO OF PAGES: 5 FAX #: (703) 746-9237 OBLON
SPIVAK
MCCLELLAND
MAIER
REUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER (703) 413-3000 GMAIER@OBLON.COM

RAYMOND F. CARDILLO, JR. (703) 413-3000 RCARDILLO@OBLON.COM

## PLEASE DELIVER TO

To:

**EXAMINER RAHMJOO** 

From:

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.

Re:

Proposed Agenda for Interview in 09/632,221 on

5/8/03 at 9:30 A.M.

- 1. A "CRT" is not an "electro-optical device" and cannot project light emitted by an "electro-optical device" as Claim 11 recite. See enclosed description of a standard CRT from the Encyclopedia of Electronics to be discussed at interview.
  - 2. Claim 20 does recite "by cutting away" as follows:

"an image extraction section that extracts <u>by cutting away</u> at least a portion of an extraction target image selected arbitrarily from among images given externally as an extraction image" (emphasis added).

3. Claims 18, 21, and 24 all require judging that "THE PROJECTION DISPLAY APPARATUS" is in a "specific operating condition." The disclosure of <u>Orita</u> determines a "density distribution characteristic" and not anything reasonably readable as a projection display apparatus operating condition. MPEP §2111 and 2111.01 require "plain meaning" to be used as understood by the artisan. The "extraction unit" of <u>Orita</u> is only part of the image processing apparatus and does not determine any condition of display 15 or the complete system.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at any time. My telephone no. is (703) 413-6508.